

FIX CANADA

20th Edition

Jeff Willerton

Copyright © 2000-2022 by Jeff Willerton

ISBN 978-1-990284-02-1

PRINTED IN CANADA

Prologue

There is a right/left paradigm in the political universe, and there are assuredly crackpots aplenty in both camps. On the far right is 0% government or anarchy, and only complete loons aspire to it. On the far left is 100% government or communism which, if history means anything, is even less desirable. The space to the left of center is shared by liberals and socialists (and not a few Conservatives) who, insofar as they contribute to society's leftward drift, were once referred to by radicals like V.I. Lenin as communism's "useful idiots."

This book is a collection of columns about a variety of political issues and personalities, many of whom could safely be described as such. These are followed by updates on the issues contained therein, with just enough history in the mix to make things make sense. As one reader exclaimed, "It's like Willerton has taken what are sometimes obscure historical facts and current events, pieced them together like a puzzle and presented it in a way that anyone can understand it."

Common Sense was a series of pamphlets written by Thomas Paine in 1775-6 advocating American independence from Great Britain. Willerton has been described as the Tom Paine of our generation, but unlike his, Willerton's vitriol is reserved, not for our mother country, but for the liberalism that afflicts it, us, and almost all western nations.

So be advised: like the fabled beanstalk that, having climbed it, gave young Jack a different perspective on this world, so too the plain words of *FIX CANADA* may change the way you view the sociopolitical events of our day.

Introduction

This book comes about as the result of the death of a very fine man. John Moerman was a teenager in WWII Holland where he worked with the Dutch underground protecting downed Allied airmen. One day he had coffee with an SS officer at his kitchen table while hiding one such airman directly underneath. It's the stuff movies are made of!

After the war, John married his sweetheart Corrie before the happy couple immigrated to the country of their liberators where they pastored churches in the Edmonton area for forty years. Retiring to a small acreage, John would there go on to become a prolific writer, not of books, but of letters to the editor in which he would articulately take on the left-leaning establishment and defend those who could not do so themselves, a cause to which he often returned. As son Jack eulogized, his father fearlessly took on both Nazis and Canadian politicians alike!

His work was sent regularly to over 200 publications across Canada. And thus it happened that when the publisher of our local weekly needed a conservative columnist to complete his revised editorial page, the retired pastor heard the call. That is to say he heard the phone ring, accepted the offered promotion and became a very fine weekly columnist. Sadly, it would be his last paying gig. Six months later, without so much as a hint of either physical or mental decline, he was gone.

To understand how John affected the lives of the people he touched, one need only consider the example of the receptionist at the doctor's office where he had been taking his beloved Corrie before his passing. The two had been there about a dozen times. When informed of why a forthcoming appointment had to be canceled (his passing) she—the receptionist—simply exploded into tears right there in the office. Such was the effect he had on people who knew him even casually. I know because I count myself among them.

It had been my privilege to meet John on three occasions. The first was in my role as a salesman in 1997. I introduced myself. He interjected: "Would that be the same Jeff Willerton who ran for Social Credit down in Calgary two weeks ago?" Note there were probably 300 candidates across the province in that election, Alberta is three times the size of a unified Germany and I was a long way from home. Obviously this gentleman had a mind for details. He and Corrie and I coffeed away the balance of a very enjoyable afternoon in their quaint abode, about a stone's throw north of Mayerthorpe, Alberta.

The second time we met was at their 50th wedding anniversary into which I almost accidentally stumbled. Cornered by an acquaintance into competing in a karaoke contest at the local hotel, I once again found myself in Mayerthorpe. Trophy in hand, on the way out of town I stopped to coffee with yet another acquaintance who informed me of the then ongoing festivities to which an open invitation had been extended, and to which I informed him we simply had to go. Again, a good time was had with the Moermans.

The third, two days later, was a brief encounter in which I gave John some literature he'd requested. It was brief but, as always, meaningful. He concluded it by looking me in the eye and, with a little twinkle in his own, saying "I think we think alike on a lot of issues." It was a meaningful encounter with a great man made more so by his sudden departure from the world five days later.

And John's passing left more than an ache in the heart of all who knew him; it also left a column-sized void on the editorial page of our local paper. *And I wanted that space!* I'd been writing letters to the editor for some time, as had John before being elevated to the status of weekly columnist. His last words to me were, in effect, that we were of the same mind on many issues – *a veritable passing of the mantle if you will!* In the beginning, the space he had occupied became a guest column. Your humble scribe filled it every week but three in the ensuing six months, at which point the powers that be finally succumbed to mounting public pressure (I'm public!)

Introduction

and gave it to me as my own byline. Much of what you hold in your hand is a compilation of those columns written over the year and a half following John's passing. Or, more accurately, close approximations thereof.

When a column or article is republished with a date included, it is implied that what follows was originally published, verbatim, on that date. That is not the case here. These columns have been edited for brevity and clarity, and in some cases just to fix my mistakes. (Why repeat them, right?) So I confess: I bent the rules, but I calculated that if the crime minister can fly to a Bahamian island on the Aga Khan's dime¹ and spend the weekend at the cottage with the fam after telling the rest of us not to² (etc., etc., etc.) I can give you a better finished product... so I did.

With that little housekeeping detail out of the way, I will conclude this portion of the introduction by repeating that the book you're presently reading came about in no small part as the result of the passing of a very fine man, and truer words would be hard to find. His name was John Moerman, and I hope in these opening pages to have in some small way honoured his memory.

The column was largely a critique of the liberal policies imposed on us by various levels of government. Left-leaning federates, for instance, have done more than their share of damage to this country, and unfortunately the provinces have by and large marched lock step with them to the edge of the abyss.

Ralph Klein, for instance, the country's then most supposedly conservative premier, spent money more liberally per capita than even our most profligate (pre-Trudeau the Lesser) federal government. He had it to spend you might argue, but so did Peter Lougheed, the province's first in a long line of Conservative premiers, and it was clearly the latter's unbridled spending that landed Alberta in the soup in the first place. (On the day Lougheed left office, the Alberta government was spending eighteen times what it was spending the day he took office – *eighteen times!*) Both men's enduring reputations as

conservative hawks testify to the efficacy of double-speak and smoke-and-mirror politics, as you will see.

Ralph Klein has shuffled off the mortal coil, of course, and Jean Chretien, another prominent figure in the book, has long since departed the political stage. So why read about them? Why did your humble scribe read a book about Lougheed twenty years after he left office? Or why would one ever read about Trudeau Sr., or Napoleon? Because it's history, of course, and we all know what happens if we don't learn from it....

The columns were written as issues arose, so to read them chronologically would be to bounce from one issue and jurisdiction to another and back again. To simplify, the book has been divided into two sections. The first deals primarily with provincial issues in Alberta, issues largely shared by other provinces. The author might have written a similar column in P.E.I., for instance, but it's probably a good thing this unfolded in Alberta as Ralph Klein cut a somewhat more national and obviously more colourful figure than Pat Binns. Who? Exactly! The second section deals with federal and international issues. An attempt was also made to gather issues together, when possible, without violating the above divisions.

Being somewhat controversial, obviously the column was not without its detractors. One memorable day a reader tore a strip off me for a) spilling too much ink on the then governing provincial Tories [understandably, as he was a member of their local constituency association] and b) being overly negative.

To respond to the second accusation first, I confess my guilt: I was negative. One must add, though, that it would be a poor columnist indeed who put a positive spin on events while being governed into the proverbial toilet. The author is no defender of socialist governments (perish the thought) but the New Democratic Party (NDP) didn't create the mess that was Alberta in 2015, except insofar as they promoted the province's leftward drift from the opposition benches. So they didn't create the mess so much as inherit it, but as can be expected from an overtly socialist government they

Introduction

proceeded to take a bad thing and make it demonstrably worse by growing government, raising taxes, shutting down an entire industry (in this case, coal) and generally turning what was an ailing economy into a veritable briar patch. The United Conservative Party (UCP) that followed ‘the Dippers’ would one-up them by shutting down the whole province, but I’m getting a little ahead of myself.

In response to the accusation of spilling too much ink on the provincial Tories, a) it was a political column, b) they were in power, and c) as another reader aptly put it, “They deserved every drop!” And so they did. They’re far from alone, of course, but if the most notably conservative government in Canada was as liberal—and thus duplicitous—as revealed in these pages, we obviously have a lot of rooting out to do. And not only provincially.

The federal Liberals and what was the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada have not only been almost equally culpable for our nation’s decline, they’ve been virtually indistinguishable. They’ve been aptly compared to two vehicles splashing each other with mud, traveling on the same road, in the same direction to the exact same destination, and sadly what is now the Conservative Party of Canada is becoming more ‘progressive’ by the day, but I’ll come back to that.

Aware of the over-arching similarities between the parties, the players seemed entirely comfortable under either banner. Tory cabinet minister and one-time party leader Jean Charest, for instance, served as the Liberal premier of Quebec for three terms; admitted Trudeau fan and long-time Liberal Ralph Klein likewise served as the Conservative premier of Alberta for almost fourteen years; and one-time Conservative Prime Minister Joe Clark was seen campaigning for our very own Benedict Arnold (aka Scott Brison) in Nova Scotia in 2004.

If you can’t quite place the name, Benedict Arnold was BFF with George Washington and a general in the revolutionary army before defecting to the British, making him pretty

much the ultimate floor-crosser. If you're over seventy and unfamiliar with the acronym, BFF stands for 'best friends forever', the closeness of their relationship making the defection that much more egregious.

North of the 49th, many Canadians seem determined to vote as they and their families have for the last hundred years, apparently more concerned with maintaining tradition than seeking good governance. I'm referring now to those who persist in voting Liberal no matter how duplicitous and corrupt they're revealed to be; Tory no matter how liberal they become; or NDP regardless of the carnage that party leaves behind every time they manage to grasp the levers of the economy.

Many Albertans, for instance, will vote for the United Conservative Party come hell or high water, a) because they always vote for the party with 'Conservative' in its name (which is better than voting for the party with 'Liberal' in its name, but that's not saying much) b) because they liked its first silver-tongued leader whom you will learn more about in these pages, or c) to keep the NDP at bay. That last reason is entirely laudable by the way, but my objective in publishing this collection of words is to help people across the country make better, more informed choices going forward. In the voting booth. And maybe elsewhere, too. You'll see.

And without question it was a privilege to write the column that got this ball rolling. I had no formal post-secondary training either as a writer or in the subject matter contained herein. I was just a high school educated guy in his mid-thirties who liked to play connect the dots and had a passion for promoting better government. To do so, obviously it would help to know a little bit about the subject.

To that end, you might say I had built a sort of grid of information over the years through which new information and events were filtered. To the extent the grid was faulty, so too would be my interpretation of those developments. Likewise to the extent the grid was properly built. You will be the judge as to its construction.

Introduction

To understand the early columns, one must be made aware of what were then some recent developments in the province. One was the Supreme Court of Canada's Vriend decision in April of 1998 in which the high court agreed with an Alberta Court of Queen's Bench ruling to read 'sexual orientation' into the province's Individual Rights legislation. Another was that over the previous years the Tory government had brought electronic gambling devices known as Video Lottery Terminals into the province and placed them pretty much anywhere a person could sit down for a cold one.

Vriend, VLTs, judge-made law, major political cover-ups and many other issues are dealt with in these pages. Occasionally some good news even creeps in. Depending on one's existing paradigm, or world view, one might find points with which one agrees and others with which one will perhaps even strongly disagree. Hopefully more of the former than the latter.

Should the column itself, though, have been written? It was well received by the readership, so probably, yes. But more to the point, should the book itself have been 'honed and redesigned' these several times as I approach the publication of this twentieth and—keeping in mind that I've said this fifteen times now—presumably final edition? In fact, I was almost daily asking myself a similar question in the spring of '07 for reasons that will later be made clear. The answer came while reading a book on 18th century philosopher Adam Smith.

Smith is widely revered as the Father of Capitalism for his work, *Wealth of the Nations* (1776). This much I knew. What I discovered therein was that *Wealth* was almost an addendum to his earlier, seminal work entitled *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. This he first published in 1759 – and republished, "honed and redesigned,"³ five times in the thirty-one years following.

Well hold the phone and note the timing! Questioning if I was on the right road publishing and republishing a book to a significant extent on Smith's 'moral sentiments' – social issues in today's lingo—it came to my attention the one I was on had been trod before by no less than the Father of Capitalism

himself! The moment was surreal, and after it there was simply no question about continuing with this project. Not everyone will share my enthusiasm.

Comparing the home of the brave with our native land, one McGill University economist surmised: “You can be a social conservative in the U.S. without being labeled a whacko. Not in Canada.” Having spent much time in both countries, I can attest to the veracity of that statement and know full-well that some of my fellow Canadians will be tempted to write me off in short order.

I believe, for instance, that it’s wrong for society to normalize, promote or, disregarding a little thing called freedom of speech, in any way discourage legitimate discourse on what many consider an emerging plethora of harmful lifestyle choices. I likewise believe that it’s wrong for governments to place what’s known as the crack cocaine of gambling devices under people’s noses in bars and restaurants across the land, and like John Moerman before me I also do my editorial best to defend those yet incapable of doing so themselves.

One is, of course, free to disagree with any or all of these positions. Unfortunately for those who do, those issues are the first three dealt with in the book you’re presently reading and comprise the first approximately dozen columns. And then like a dog with a bone buried in the back yard, I occasionally return to them.

Winston Churchill defined a fanatic as “one who can’t change his mind and won’t change the subject.” Again you will be the judge, this time as to whether I qualify.

I by no means have the final word on the issues contained herein, but humbly submit my thoughts on them to you for your consideration. They may enrich or enrage you—or both—but I suspect they won’t leave you entirely unmoved. So hold on to your seat, and let’s go for a ride.

Provincial Issues

Orientation a choice?

April 20, 1998

Many will disagree with this statement, but I maintain that sexual orientation is—at least likely—a choice. What can be said definitively is that there is no empirical evidence to support the theory that people are born gay, and that there is what would be approaching a mountain of circumstantial evidence indicating the opposite.

Consider, for example, the innumerable instances of genetically identical twins in which one embraces the gay lifestyle and the other not. If they were 'born that way', as the argument goes, does it not stand to reason that they would both be either gay or straight? Perhaps I'm just not worldly enough, but it seems to me there must be something else going on here.

Consider also the hypothetical example of identical twin boys separated at birth: one raised by a heterosexual couple; the other by two gay men. Ask yourself honestly: which child do you think will be more inclined to experiment with the homosexual lifestyle? It's a rhetorical question. That environment influences development is a long established fact.

That having been said, I'm not 'anti-gay', and I think I speak for the majority when I say that the backlash in Alberta against the Supreme Court's Vriend decision (reading sexual orientation into the province's human rights legislation) is not born out of any animus toward the homosexual community. Most people, your scribe included, have a live-and-let-live mentality. What they don't want—and again I think I speak for the majority here—is for homosexuals to be given carte blanche to mold our youth in the school system or anywhere else for that matter. People need to be free to

live their lives without fear of being bullied obviously, but so too others need to be free to protect their loved ones from exposure to the promotion of what is widely understood to be an enormously destructive lifestyle.⁴

And by no means should anyone be put at ease by Premier Ralph Klein's repeated assertion that 'fences' will be put up around the areas of fostering and adoption. Not many months ago the same Ralph Klein was specifically musing about permitting the same, so his opposition to it now seems a tad contrived, not that it matters. In reality the fences will be built; they will be challenged; and they will be torn down. After Vriend it'll be child's play for the gay lobby.

Governments' primary task is to create an environment in which it is safe to live, work and do business. I repeat, 'safe-to-live'! To promote or encourage the promotion of a lifestyle widely known to slay its adherents in their prime is entirely antithetical to that mandate.

UPDATE: Note that post-Vriend, no attempt was made to build the aforementioned fences in Alberta, and that the ensuing onslaught of gay and lesbian applications for fostering and adoption were approved as fast as they came in. But the question has to be asked: is this good for the kids?

In fact, a study published in the February 2015 issue of the *British Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science* has concluded that children raised by same-sex parents are almost twice as likely as their opposite-sex-parent counterparts to seek the help of mental health professionals. So it's arguably very unhealthy for them, but sadly legislation with the potential to rob the author of his right to say so came into effect in 2004. It began as a bill to include sexual orientation in hate crimes legislation brought forward by the country's first openly gay Member of Parliament, Svend Robinson.

The passage of said legislation unquestionably led to the Supreme Court's decision against Bill Whatcott in *Whatcott v. The Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission* (2013).

Bill likes flyers. Some don't like Bill's flyers (they are rather graphic) and in the aforementioned decision the Supremes' decreed that should one offend a member of a protected class in society, merely having the truth on one's side is an inadequate defense. But telling you what you can't say is so 2013!

Following the passage of Bill C-16 four years later, were you to correctly gender a biological male in this country who's convinced he's otherwise as a 'he', for instance, you may well end up behind bars for two years, or as in the case of aforementioned Mr. Whatcott (our proverbial canary in the freedom of speech coal mine) with a \$55,000 fine. So in this country, since 2017, you can be incarcerated for lying in court (it's called perjury) but taken to the cleaners for speaking words of sober truth on its doorstep.

And, of course, with liberals in charge things are going from bad to worse in a hurry in this country, and in 2021 Bill C-4 (the so-called conversion therapy bill) *unanimously* passed the House of Commons. This legislation threatens parents and counsellors and such with five years behind bars if they have the temerity to tell little Johnny, if he's questioning it, that he's a boy. And what is known as the online censorship bill, Bill C-11, takes this brazen attack on free speech to a whole new level. And how did we get to this point?

Seventeenth century philosopher John Locke holds the dubious distinction of being the father of liberalism, but the last leg of our journey arguably began when Pierre Elliot Trudeau, the father of our current prime minister, bequeathed us with The Charter of Rights and Freedoms in 1982 after promising no less than seven times prior to its passage that it would not lead to gay marriage. Though one can't know that he was consciously misleading us, if gay marriage can be shown to be detrimental to western society, and he to have subscribed to a philosophy hell-bent on its downfall, then obviously the possibility looms large.

A confidante of Castro and an open admirer of Mao, a woman Trudeau went to university with maintains he was then a proud card-carrying member of the Communist

Party of Canada. According to an internal 1968 RCMP report (trumpeted by a retired officer stumping for political office) our then future prime minister also had the distinction of leading a delegation of communists to the 1952 Moscow Economic Forum. But wait! There's more....

In the man's own words, "(B)etween the years 1952 and 1960 I was several times forbidden to teach in the universities... because of my anticlerical and *communist leanings*"⁵ (emphasis added). He was being coy.

When asked as prime minister about his views on communism, he replied that "under certain conditions 'a one-party state' would be ideal." That phrase is merely a euphemism for communism, of course, and no one but a communist would recommend it for any country under any circumstances. And remember: he said this as prime minister, so these "leanings" as he described them were no mere youthful indiscretion as some maintain.

In light of these observations (and I've barely scratched the surface here) even the most blinkered Liberal has to concede the possibility that his/her hero's signature achievement was never the benevolent document that was sold to us, but rather a Trojan Horse from which continues to creep sundry enemies of the state. Like gay marriage. Allow me to explain.

In 1932, Stalin published his agenda for the west which included the advocacy of "companionate marriage."⁶ Shack-ups. Why? To "destroy the bonds of domestic life... *by doing away with marriage*"⁷ (emphasis added). One way to destroy a venerable institution would be to remove all meaning from it, thus explaining what the author believes has been the very intentional watering down of the definition of matrimony in the west these past fifty odd years, give or take.

Why would communists promote homosexuality abroad while continuing to ban even its tacit promotion at home? (Remember Sochi?) To promote the demise of western civilization, and the preservation of their own, is frankly the only explanation that makes a lick of sense. More to follow....